



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,109	11/03/2000	Scott Nedderman	17200-074US1	9251
54205	7590	06/19/2007	EXAMINER	
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP			KANG, INSUN	
30 ROCKEFELER PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10112			2193	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/19/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/708,109	NEDDERMAN, SCOTT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Insun Kang	2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the response to restriction requirement filed on 3/30/2007.
2. As per applicant's request, claims 1-92 have been elected and claims 93-104 are non-elected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US Patent 6,535,883) herein after referred to as "Lee" in view of Bahrs et al. (US Patent 6,654,932) hereafter Bahrs.

Per claim 1:

Lee discloses:

-receiving information over a communications network ("server computer...confirming data input by a user of the mobile computer," col. 4 lines 5-25)

retrieving customizable validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and determining computer data validity by applying the retrieved validation rules to the information ("In order to ensure the validity of the data entered by the worker, some or all of the fields will have an associated validation rule... for performing one or more tests or comparisons on data in one or more fields to make sure the data

is valid...The validation rules are loaded ...and validation rules associated with fields in the rules file are associated ...with the corresponding field names in the MPA. The validation rules test the contents of each field entered by the user to ensure that the field is filled out correctly," col. 2 lines 24-40).

Lee does not explicitly teach retrieving customizable validation rules from a hereditary rules library. Bahrs teaches a hereditary rules library having customizable validation rules was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend the validation rules (i.e. a class that extends ValidationRule is created in step 3202 in Fig 32). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Bahrs. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Bahrs.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses highlighting information determined to be invalid by the validation rules (see Fig 14) .

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a server (“Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41).

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page (“a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms,” col. 4 lines 28-41).

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (“Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41).

Per claims 7-12, they are the system versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 13-18, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 19-24, they are the apparatus versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claim 25:

Lee discloses identifying data types requiring validation and providing customizable validation rules stored in a memory device for the associated data types from a rules library (“Sets of validation rules are created for a form interactively, by selecting fields, adding appropriate validation rules to be implemented for the fields, and adding appropriate expressions for the validation rules,” col. 3 lines 19-40).

Lee does not explicitly teach the library is a hereditary rules library. Bahrs teaches a hereditary rules having customizable validation rules was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend the validation rules (i.e. a class that extends ValidationRule is created in step 3202 in Fig 32). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Bahrs. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Bahrs.

Per claim 26:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a client (“Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 27:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a server (“Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 28:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page (“a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms,” col. 4 lines 28-41) .

Per claim 29:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (“Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Art Unit: 2193

Per claims 30-34, they are the system versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 35-39, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 40-44, they are the apparatus versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claim 45

Lee discloses:

-providing a rules library and an initial parent rule stored in a memory device (The menu presents the expressions as expression templates, which are templates for creating and completing an expression,” col. 3 lines 40-54)

- building customizable validation rules by members of templates (“allows a user to create a validation rule by selecting a template and fill in the blanks,” col. 3 lines 50-54) .

Lee does not explicitly teach building customizable validation rules by subclassing members of a hereditary rules library class hierarchy. Bahrs teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend the validation rules by subclassing from the parent class (i.e. a class that extends ValidationRule is created in step 3202 in Fig 32). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Bahrs. The modification would be obvious

because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Bahrs.

Per claim 46:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing subclassed validation rules in the rule library (“enables a user to create a set of form validation rules...Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file,” col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 47:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Bahrs discloses that the subclassed validation rules inherit validation logic from a parent rule (i.e. a class that extends ValidationRule is created in step 3202 in Fig 32).

Per claim 48:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are associated with data types (Table 2, col. 11 lines 31-60) .

Per claim 49:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page (“receiving data including the input data from the form submitted to a server,” col. 2 lines 33-40) (“it is determined whether the input data is valid using information stored in the registry,” col. 2 lines 33-44)

Per claim 50:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (“Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41).

Per claims 51-56, they are the system versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 57-62, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 63-68, they are the apparatus versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claim 69:

Lee discloses:

-marking data types for associated customizable validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and providing validation marked data types (col. Lines 29-41).

Lee does not explicitly teach the library is a hereditary rules library. Bahrs teaches a hereditary rules having customizable validation rules was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend the validation rules (i.e. a class that extends

ValidationRule is created in step 3202 in Fig 32). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Bahrs. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Bahrs.

Per claim 70:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses:

- building forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 71:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 72:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses providing forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types over a communications network (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 73:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page (col. Lines 29-41).

Per claim 74:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claims 75-80, they are the system versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 81-86, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 87-92, they are the apparatus versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant states that the two groups of claims 1-92 and 93-104 would be no undue burden on the Examiner for examination.

In response, the two groups are distinct as one group is drawn to methods for providing customizable validation rules from a hereditary rules library that does not discuss the determination of browser capability of Group II having a separate utility as a subcombination. The elected claims 1-92 have been further examined above.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 571-272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 6:30-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MENG AI AN can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

I. Kang
Examiner



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100